

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2379

If we look at these groups and their particular disadvantages, we will know how to fight the five-front war against poverty.

Some programs are underway or under consideration for these groups. With this legislation in prospective, let us see how it all fits into the entire picture.

I think of five major groups who have unusual barriers against full participation in our economy. First, the young and undereducated. Their unemployment rate is double that for the population generally. We have some programs such as aid to education and the Vocational Educational Act for the young, but something radically new is needed because our entire educational system is based on the assumption that it would take place in a middle-class community where a great deal of the process of education is carried on at home. In the case of a young person whose parents are poor and uneducated and who lives in rural or urban slums, the basic assumption is false. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1964 will help to eradicate slums and improve the environment in which our young people are growing up; but other programs directed specifically toward this problem are needed.

The second group are the middle aged who are either untrained or whose skills have been shot out from under them either by automation or other technical change. The Manpower Retraining and Development Act is a possible answer to the problems of this group.

The third group are our older citizens and particularly those whose life savings have been, or may be, wiped out by disastrous illness. The Hospital Insurance Act of 1964 now pending before the Ways and Means Committee is this administration's answer to the particular needs of this group.

The fourth category of people are those whose lot is inextricably linked to a geographical area which is economically depressed. One answer to this group is the extension of the Area Redevelopment Act which has been reported by my Committee on Banking and Currency and is now pending in the Rules Committee.

We must also have Federal aid for the development of mass transportation facilities in urban centers.

Another answer to a major geographical area poverty problem is the President's Appalachian program.

The fifth major category are citizens of minority groups subjected to discrimination. One answer to this group is the Civil Rights Act and particularly title VII thereof passed by the House of Representatives and now being debated in the other body.

The common thread running through each of the five foregoing categories is that each one of them has one or more handicaps which make it more difficult for them to participate fully in the free enterprise system.

Worst of all, these handicaps tend to be handed on from parents to the children.

The uneducated father tends to be poor and live in a slum, bringing up his children in a home environment which does not contribute to the educational process. At the same time and to our shame, the schools in such a neighborhood tend to be well below average and, thus, the vicious cycle repeats itself.

The new and exciting thing about this legislation is that, with its emphasis on young people, it recognizes that the greatest challenge is to break these patterns of poverty which occur generation after generation.

I believe it was this objective that the President had in mind when in his poverty message he said, "the years of high school and college age are the most critical stage of a young person's life. If they are not helped

then, many will be condemned to a life of poverty which they, in turn, will pass on to their children." That is the real meaning of the President's recommendation for the creation of a Job Corps, a work-training program and work-study program.

These proposals are excellent and I certainly urge the committee to support them.

However, I also urge the committee to consider at least on a pilot project basis, a program of special assistance to primary schools located in our poorest neighborhoods. It is in these schools that Johnny learns or does not learn to read. Because Johnny receives less reading assistance at home, these schools should be above average, and yet we all know too well that they are usually at the bottom of the educational ladder. The 6-year-old today who is not learning properly how to read will have dropped out of high school 10 years from now and will be a candidate for the Job Corps for which future Congresses will be called upon to appropriate money.

I call your attention to an article in the May 1964, issue of Harper's magazine. It is entitled "Give Slum Children a Chance: A Radical Proposal." This article is taken from a book to be published by Random House called "Crisis in Black and White." The author is Mr. Charles E. Silberman. Mr. Silberman is a member of the board of editors of Fortune magazine and a lecturer in economics at Columbia University. Mr. Silberman points out:

"The root of the problem educationally is that the slum child does not learn to read properly in the first two grades. Whether because of this reading disability alone, or because of difficulty in handling abstract concepts that stem from independent causes, the slum child falls further and further behind after the third grade; the gap widens, and his IQ actually declines. His failure to read properly affects a lot more than his school work. It has a profound impact on how he regards himself and consequently on how he regards school. Poor reading skill at the start is the major cause of school drop-outs and subsequent unemployment."

Dr. Silberman says:

"Nothing less than a radical reorganization of American elementary education is necessary, therefore, if the schools are to begin to discharge their obligation to teach the Negro and white slum youngsters. To reverse the effects of a starved environment, the schools must begin admitting children at the age of 3 or 4, instead of at 5 or 6. The nursery school holds the key to the future—but a very different kind of nursery school from the one most Americans are familiar with."

I recommend that the members of this committee give careful consideration to Mr. Silberman's proposals. In fact, I believe that a highly profitable study could be made of the pilot programs upon which Mr. Silberman bases his proposals.

If we can prevent the problem from developing, we can cut down or eliminate the job corps in the future and know with reasonable assurance that we have broken the pattern of poverty.

It seems to me that the war on poverty program which Mr. Sargent Shriver has put together for the President and unfolded before Congress reflects realistic, workable, and indeed conservative economic principles.

The United States has been hailed for our generosity to people in need in all parts of the world. The American people have given generously of their resources as a matter of responsibility. This same sense of responsibility makes a demand upon the national conscience that cannot be ignored.

Our response to this problem of poverty amidst plenty must come from the heart. It must spring from conviction. It must be intelligent. It must be comprehensive. America should not settle for less.

Opportunity Knocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the May issue of Connecticut Industry. This article discusses the program of the United Aircraft Corp. at Trinity College's summer engineering laboratory which will guide high school juniors in choosing engineering careers.

I believe programs such as the one which is described here will enable us to alleviate the serious shortage of engineers today as well as encourage our young men to remain in school and drop out without adequate preparation.

I congratulate the United Aircraft Corp. for initiating this fine program.

The article follows:

UNITED AIRCRAFT-TRINITY COLLEGE PROJECT
SPARKS INTEREST IN ENGINEERING CAREER

High school juniors of Connecticut get another opportunity this summer to decide whether they wish to become engineers.

For the second year, United Aircraft Corp. will sponsor Trinity College's summer engineering laboratory. The 8-week scholarship program providing full tuition to qualified students will be conducted from June 29 through August 23. It offers two college courses for credit to Connecticut young men who have completed the 11th grade by June of this year.

The unique laboratory program begun in 1963 by Trinity under a grant from United Aircraft was developed by Dr. Robert M. Vogel, dean of the college and formerly dean of graduate studies and director of summer studies at Trinity.

"Development of a serious shortage of engineers today," Dr. Vogel has pointed out, is at least partially due to high school seniors having to make an early choice of career interest with no chance to examine engineering nor to consider its challenges and opportunities. Trinity, felt, however, that high schools are limited in the time they can devote to science and cannot be expected to add introductory courses in engineering.

The summer engineering laboratory was established at Trinity as a partial solution to a double problem: the early career choice faced by students and a shortage of engineers faced by the Nation.

Commenting on this voluntary sponsorship of the program, UAC President William Gwinn stated, "United Aircraft, as a company built around engineering, has long been concerned at the widening gap between the national demand for engineers and the number of graduates coming out of the engineering colleges. We are gratified by the opportunity to join with Trinity in encouraging talented high school students to consider engineering as a career by providing them with an introduction to the field through Trinity's summer engineering laboratory."

In two college courses (introduction to engineering science and philosophy of science) the students are introduced to modern engineering concepts in a program enabling them to investigate the relation of science to man's development and culture.

Last summer, 38 Connecticut high school juniors participated in the laboratory under United Aircraft-scholarships. Although too early to make any long-range predictions

A2380

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 8

concerning its effect on career choices, the program was considered a success. The laboratory was enthusiastically received and the students confirmed what Trinity has believed since establishing the transition to college plan in 1958; that high school students, properly selected, are capable of doing outstanding work at the college level.

It will be noted that eligibility requirements favor no particular industry. To qualify for Trinity's summer engineering laboratory, a student must be a resident of Connecticut who has completed the 11th grade with study including 1 year of chemistry and 3 years of college preparatory mathematics. Further information may be obtained from Trinity College, office of summer session and graduate studies.

New Parity Ratio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the doctors of statistics apparently are operating again down in the Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year I commented on the newly adjusted parity ratio which was being used for the first time at the direction of the policymakers in the Department. Secretary Freeman and his sides apparently are unwilling to accept the fact that the parity ratio of farm income has been consistently skidding ever since he took over the office. The farm parity ratio stood at 80 percent in 1961 when the present Secretary of Agriculture came into office and the parity ratio has been skidding year by year since that time. It now stands at the lowest point since the depression years of the 1930's—the Department of Agriculture reported that the parity ratio for April 15, 1964, was 75 percent—down 2 points from the month preceding and down 3 points from last year at the same time.

Not being satisfied with allowing the farmer's income to fall to depression levels during a period of supposed prosperity for all other segments of our Nation's economy, the statistics manipulators in the Department of Agriculture again seem to be doing their best to sweep the situation under the rug. I refer to the farm income situation report put out by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture for release on April 29 of this year. You will look in vain through this entire publication for any reference to the parity ratio having slipped to 75 percent during the month of April. What is reported in this publication is a parity ratio of 95.6 percent for the year 1962 and this parity ratio is based on an index of 1957-59=100.

The parity ratio that we American farmers are accustomed to is the one established by law in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and for reference purposes this legally defined parity ratio figure is the one which is meaningful and is a true indicator of the farmer's economic plight.

The normal parity ratio figure of 75 percent for April 15 gives a clear indication of the extent to which American agriculture today is being depressed by a cost-price squeeze such as we have never experienced before. To illustrate this point, I include a brief article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, May 5, 1964, stating that "Farm commodities head still lower in price despite the economy's continuing climb," in the Appendix of the Record:

COMMODITY LETTER—A SPECIAL REPORT ON PRODUCTION AND PRICE TRENDS AFFECTING HOMES AND FACTORIES

Farm commodities head still lower in price despite the economy's continuing climb.

While business generally pushes steadily higher, farm prices move in the opposite direction. Prices farmers received for their products at mid-April fell to 236 percent of the 1910-14 average, 8 points less than a year ago, and the lowest for this season since 1957. Such basic farm products as beef cattle, poultry, wheat, eggs, cotton, and tobacco now bring lower prices than a year ago.

A number of farm products may well slide further in price over the coming months. Wheat and cotton are expected to show price decline when the new farm law goes into effect July 1. Sugar prices soften as a result of a bumper beet crop. Some foreign farm commodities are likely to decline, too. Coffee prices are threatened by a possible boost in export quotas, which would swell shipments from Brazil's reserve stock.

The cost of goods and services farmers buy keeps rising, cutting farm purchasing power to the lowest point since 1939.

Student Presidential Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the national student poll on presidential candidates may be of considerable interest because the results of this student vote in the past have reflected the thinking of parents on the selection of a President.

The vote taken recently in the Conrad Weiser High School at Robeson, Pa.—near Reading—in my congressional district showed the following votes for candidates whose names were printed on the presidential ballot:

Johnson.....	481
Nixon.....	118
Lodge.....	115
Goldwater.....	61
Rockefeller.....	24
Smith.....	20
Scranton.....	18
Wallace.....	6
Romney.....	1
Stassen.....	0

There was also a scattering of write-in votes. Robert Kennedy, whose name was not printed on the ballot, received 37 write-ins.

In 1956 the student poll came within 1.3 percent of the final national results. The 1960 poll was as follows: Democrat, 53.4 percent; Republican, 46.4 percent.

Actual results were Democrat, 49.7 percent; Republican, 49.5 percent.

The Conrad Weiser teachers whose students participated in this poll were: Grade 7, Mr. Thomas Golden; grade 8, Mr. Elwood Himmelberger; grade 9, Mr. Wayne Seifarth; grade 10, Mrs. Howard Suhr; grade 11, Mr. Gordan Jones; grade 12, Mr. Donald Seltzer.

Aircraft in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial which appeared in the May 4, 1964, issue of the Los Angeles Times concerning U.S. aircraft in use in Vietnam.

There seems to be no question that the use of less than adequate aircraft in Vietnam has unduly endangered the lives of Americans and others. This situation has been a matter of concern for a good many months.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the Los Angeles Times editorial in the Record, as follows:

OUR WEAK VIETNAM AIR ARM

The posthumously published letters of a U.S. Air Force captain killed in combat in Vietnam reveal disturbingly the inadequacy of an important phase of the American commitment to that war, and the shocking lack of preparedness for it.

Capt. Edwin Shank's correspondence indicates that in Vietnam we are trying to fight a war largely with World War II equipment and with flyers who, unfortunately, were trained primarily for the wrong kind of airplanes and the wrong kind of missions.

Trained himself to fly multiengine jet aircraft, Captain Shank was assigned to piloting T-28 modified single-engine trainers, used in Vietnam as tactical fighter-bomber support for ground troops.

The principal U.S. bombers available in Vietnam, at least through March when Shank was killed, were World War II-model B-26's. These planes, he writes, were finally either grounded or limited to level bombing attacks. The reason is that the 20-year-old planes tended to fall apart when subjected to non-routine stresses.

Captain Shank's letters make it woefully clear that, despite hundreds of billions of dollars spent for defense in recent years, we apparently do not have attack aircraft designed primarily for Vietnam-type conflicts—the kind most likely to be fought in an age of nuclear stalemate.

Blame for this situation rests squarely on the Air Force and the Defense Department. Ever since Korea the Air Force has concentrated on producing strategic weapons—missiles as well as long-range multi-jet bombers—which are completely unsuited to brush-fire warfare. Such a war requires subsonic, highly maneuverable aircraft. Supersonic nuclear bombers are of no value.

Even now, after years of experience in Vietnam, the Air Force approach to the limited war aviation problem is to modify existing planes—T-28's and T-37 jet trainers—instead of developing new ones. The Navy, on the other hand, is preparing to produce

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2381

its own limited-war plane, but it will not be available for some time.

Meanwhile, unless better planes are taken from the U.S. stockpile or quickly developed, our airmen—who do a superb job with what they have—will continue to fight with inexcusably inferior aircraft.

And our costly effort in South Vietnam, already limping, will become an even greater cripple.

Weltner Discusses the Need for Action To Make Our Cities Beautiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 1960 census of population found 2 of every 3 Americans living in our metropolitan areas. Most of the increase in our population is occurring in these urban centers. Since the end of World War II, we have spent billions of dollars in our cities, building anew and restoring.

But have we built cities which are beautiful tributes to our civilization? Have we translated our vast outlays, our mastery of technology, and our architectural and planning skills into the best possible environment for our city dwellers. The answer, of course, is in the negative. So it is time to look for the causes and the cures of our failure.

Our very able colleague from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] dealt with these questions in a masterful address to the Georgia chapter of the American Institute of Planners on April 24 in Atlanta.

I believe many Members will find his address, entitled "Urban Design, Planning and Politics," of great interest. It follows:

URBAN DESIGN, PLANNING, AND POLITICS

Thank you for your kind introduction and also for the invitation to speak to the Georgia chapter of the American Institute of Planners. The title of my remarks has already been given "Urban Design, Planning, and Politics," but my subject is the disorganized, disorderly, dirty place where the vast majority of the citizens in the United States live—cities. My first proposition is that cities are ugly and getting worse every day.

We have become so accustomed to this ugliness, to the jarring visual impact of our cityscapes, the dull monotony of the suburbs, that I think, even to planners, the point bears repeating. The present urbanization of America has the potential of being a damning indictment of man's sin against his surroundings.

You may be familiar with Peter Blake's new book, "God's Own Junkyard." The photographs in that book make one indisputable point. We live in an awful and ugly world of our own making. And we have become inured to it. Seeing the photographs, separate and individual, brought home the frightening fact that I had reached the point that I am not aware in the normal day of the mess we live in.

I won't belabor this point, for I am sure you, as professionals, agree that cities are unbeautiful, ungainly sights.

But there is, as I have mentioned, a damning quality to this ugliness—an indictment

against us, for we have built our own ugly hells. Since 1946, the first peacetime year after World War II, total construction in the United States has amounted to approximately \$725 billion.

This enormous expenditure of money for new buildings, new homes, new suburbs, new cities could have made the United States a handsome nation. We might have built a world of which we would have been proud. Rather we have built manmade vistas that reflect tinsel and shabbiness, disorder and distress, monotony and money.

The larger part of this construction has been in the private sector of our economy, a fact I will discuss later, but much of it has been financed from public funds.

For instance, since 1941, the public housing program, has cost the American Federal taxpayer \$1.3 billion for low-income housing across the Nation. And what do we have to show for it? What kind of housing have we built? What has been the visual impact of this publicly financed addition to the cityscape.

Dull, monotonous piles of dirty red brick with pounded dirt yards. The ubiquitous chain fence, the concrete-covered play yard. And if that seems to be a hard judgment, just see what kind of visual image your mind's eye creates if you think of the new high-rise public housing projects in our large cities. Those 15- to 20-storied buildings—4 or 5 all the same—and those little metal framed windows which open on the vista of the other monotonous facades across the concrete and metal playground.

And some planner planned for these eyesores to stand together—a vertical ghetto. And some architect designed those tiled tunnels, those filing cabinets for human beings, and some local public housing authority board approved the project.

The Nation, through FHA, VA, and GI loans, has insured \$57 billion of residential construction across the Nation. And what do we have to show for these publicly supported programs?

Those rows and rows of monotonous houses—with the same size living rooms, the same size bedrooms, and often the same colored paint on the same fronts, facing across a street to another row of this sameness.

And some planner planned the sites, and some architect designed the house, not the houses, they're all the same house, and the bureaucrats approved it.

Since 1949, we have had an urban renewal program, federally assisted. To date, more than \$3.7 billion of Federal funds have been committed to this program.

The program holds promise but the present realization is small. In most cities, the urban renewal director has to take you on a tour, or you would miss the newness entirely. And often the new land use is questionable, the plan is bad, and the buildings are new shiny ugliness in place of old dirty ugliness.

The Urban Planning Assistance program has committed approximately \$60 million of Federal funds since its inception in 1954. We have plans for parks, plans for sewers, streets, and schools, plans for rapid transit systems, master plans and minor plans—the shelves of the planning commissions across the Nation are overloaded with plans. Soon planning commissions will have to apply for planning funds to make plans for storing plans.

We have got to put these plans into practice—we need realities instead of more reams of paper.

My point is that the Nation has expended tremendous sums of private money in the building of cities.

The taxpayers have invested millions and millions of dollars, not only of Federal funds, but also of States and local funds to save our cities, to house our people, to bring order

and beauty to our growing manmade environment—and in Peter Blake's terms, we live in "God's Own Junkyard," our suburbs are slums and our cities are slums.

Somebody is responsible for the sight of our cities. The title of this talk might well have been, "Who's Responsible, the Professionals, the Politicians, or the Public?" For someone is responsible. Perhaps everyone of these groups is responsible, but that easy generalization leaves us with the conclusion that we hold no individual responsible.

Let me make a layman's assumption at this point. As our economic system is based on profit, our cities must meet three criteria if they are to be considered successful.

They must show a profit.

They must be a place where people can work and live, not simply exist in servitude.

They must be something of which we can be proud. By this I mean, they must be pleasing to eye. As they are the monuments of urban civilization, they should reflect the best, not the worst.

First, let us consider profit. We can assume that business will take care of itself. Many of the atrocities that have been committed on cities are done in the name of profit.

It is easy enough to lay the blame for the present state of our cityscapes and the poor quality of urban design at the doorstep of private enterprise. But this is an easy laying of the blame.

Is it or is it not true that "It don't have to be ugly to make money?" Or as a slogan, can it be proven that "Good design and planning is good business?"

As I see it, the task of answering these questions is your responsibility. If good planning is good business, then the businessman can have both beauty and a profit.

This task, your task, can't be accomplished by articles by architects and planners to architects and planners in the pages of Architectural Forum, The Journal of Housing, or the Journal of the American Institute of Planning. The businessman doesn't see these magazines. You are talking to yourselves.

And how about the politicians? City councils across the country, Congressmen and Senators, governors and mayors aren't committed to the concept of good design. They react. They react to what they know and what they feel the public wants.

The planners have taught the politicians some certain basic concepts. For instance, most cities have zoning laws. And, as you well know, most zoning laws fall far short of the ideal.

In Houston, they don't have a zoning code. There you get a tall, handsome building next to a one-floor hamburger stand with a big sidewalk-overhanging sign, and then a greasy garage.

In Atlanta, we have a zoning code. And here you have a tall, handsome building next to a one-floor hamburger joint, adjoined to a greasy garage.

And you know why as well as I. The "variance"—the way to do anything you want—with the approval of the zoning committee.

How many times at a zoning committee meeting is there a representative of the local chapter of the AIA or the AIP registering the complaint that the variance is against the best interest of the public, that it doesn't fit the "master plan" that is gathering dust somewhere?

Have you ever been to a zoning commission hearing where the local chapter of the AIA or the AIP was not only protesting, but suggesting alternatives—a hamburger stand that could bear some architectural relationship to the tall, handsome building?

At the Federal level, as I have pointed out, there is an interest and concern about cities. The passage of urban renewal, public housing, and planning legislation points this out.

A2382

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 8

My fellow southerner and colleague, ALBERT RAINES of Alabama, has made a great record as a friend of cities. His retirement at the end of this year will be a great loss to cities.

But just interest and concern is not enough—there must also be knowledge. With the multiple demands upon every Congressman, that is not easy to gain.

I am not shunning this responsibility, but I want to point out how hard it is, the knowledge has to be sought out, for it is rarely given.

One story in this regard may suffice. Last year, my committee held 2 weeks of hearings on the Urban Mass Transportation Act. During those hearings HENRY REUS of Wisconsin, a ranking Democratic member, seemed to be a lost voice in the wilderness. One day he asked:

"In all honesty, I wish we had a philosopher or two among our witnesses. What I wanted with a Frank Lloyd Wright, if he were alive, or a Lewis Mumford. I don't think we want to prolong our hearings, but I would suggest that letters be addressed to Lewis Mumford, Frederick Guthelm, the president of the American Institute of Architects, and perhaps one of two others whose names will occur to the committee, to ask if they will rather promptly file statements."

Certainly, the committee was at fault for not having called up these professionals. But is it too much to expect that they would come forward uncalled, on this important subject?

Let me bring this matter a little closer to home. Last year, Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania introduced a bill on housing, urban renewal, and community development for purposes of discussion to assist in the formulation of the new housing and community development legislation this year.

I sent approximately 10 planners, many who are here tonight, copies of Senator CLARK's bill asking for their comments and criticism. Though a number of you acknowledged receipt of this bill, I received only one detailed discussion of this legislation, and that was all. This, mind you, from the Atlanta planners. Consequently, we offered little assistance, little guidance in the drafting of the housing bill proposed this year, H.R. 9751.

When this bill was introduced, I again sent it to 10 to 15 planners and others in the field of public housing and urban renewal. This time, the same person who had replied the first time replied again. Another person wrote that his position and comments would be the same as whatever NAHRO decided at its convention a month later.

I wanted to know what Atlanta planners who would have to work with this legislation thought about it. I wanted to know its relation to Atlanta's problems and programs. Only one planner was concerned enough to help me in assessing the merits of this bill.

Perhaps every planning and design school should require its students to take a course in practical politics. It might be titled "How to put your plan into practice" or "You and the city council."

There are notable examples that professionals can convince politicians that "good design is good politics." Edmund Bacon, head of city planning in Philadelphia, drew a plan. But he didn't stop there. He also found himself a politician, Richardson Dilworth, and convinced him that "good design is good politics." The result was not a dream gathering dust on a shelf somewhere, but Penn Center.

Another example which comes to mind is Ed Logue in New Haven and his well-known convert, Mayor Richard Lee.

I briefly touched on the politicians, and the public as profit seekers, but what about the public simply as the people? They sim-

ply don't know, they haven't been taught, just as politicians haven't been taught.

There is a very pertinent Scripture that speaks to this problem:

"How then shall they call Him, in whom they have not believed?

And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?

And how shall they hear without a preacher?

And how shall they preach except they be sent?"

—Romans 10: 14-15.

And the preachers are the professionals, and the professionals are you.

When the public is aroused, when it is taught, the results border on the miraculous. Will anyone who cares about cities ever forget that great victory in San Francisco? The people would not allow that double-decked expressway to ruin a magnificent vista of city hall.

The art of the planner and the architect is a ubiquitous one. If plans are to be more than dust gatherers, they must be translated into new cities. And these cities are the habitat of people. They cannot avoid the ugliness of the cities; they can only live in them. They cannot ignore the effect that slums and slums, disorder and poor design have upon them. They become apathetic and disinterested.

Not everyone is responsible. Each one is responsible. The politician has the responsibility to learn, the public the responsibility to speak out. But the great and historic responsibility belongs to the professional, to you.

History does not blame the audiences when generations pass without a single notable play or poem—it speaks of the dearth of poets and playwrights. And history will not look upon the manmade desecration of landscapes and hold the politician and public to account—it will speak of the failure of the professionals—the planners, designers, and architects.

Your art is not academic. It cannot be contained in plans and renderings of cities that never rise. Your conversations cannot be among yourselves in professional journals and conferences.

A plan, never initiated, never explained, never taught will be a poor defense to history's indictment.

The Not Exactly Mild-Mannered Man From Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, May 8 is the birthday of a very wonderful young man. Eighty years have not dimmed the twinkle in his eye nor dulled his wit. His enthusiasm for life and for politics as well as his courage, decisiveness, and leadership have endeared him to all of us. Newspapers throughout the country are editorially wishing President Harry S. Truman a happy birthday. The Christian Science Monitor and the New York Times comments which follow are examples of the high regard and deep affection with which we hold the gentleman from Missouri.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 8, 1964]

NOT EXACTLY MILD MANNERED

"I am not exactly a mild-mannered campaigner myself," said Harry Truman in a rare moment of understatement the other day. Suddenly we realized how indelibly the Truman manner remains in our minds. He was supposed to be so colorless when he assumed the Presidency. He proved to have a spectrum all his own.

Now at 80 Mr. Truman warns today's campaigners against sacrificing the national interest for partisan political advantage. As for himself, he has changed his mind and won't run again at 90.

The partisan feelings of politicians and music critics have cooled as Mr. Truman's distance from the White House has lengthened. Or so it seems to us, even though, from time to time, he still says things not calculated to win friends or influence Republicans.

At the opening of the World's Fair, he called himself "an old has-been." The crowd said, "No." And so do we. "I hope you will remember what I have been and not what I am today," said Mr. Truman. As we read of him now, getting to his office at 7:30 in the morning, before the staff comes in, we want to remember him not only for his decisive days as President but his unremitting retirement since then.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1964]

MAN FROM MISSOURI

Harry S. Truman, who is 80 years old today, is a particularly lively elder statesman: having been President of the United States, he is now historian, teacher, peripatetic philosopher and—by no means least—a politician.

Mr. Truman could no more keep out of politics than a journalist could ignore the news. A few days ago one of his innumerable young visitors asked him whether he would recommend politics as a career and he replied that he certainly would "if you like people and can get along with them and are willing to start at the bottom." This is no recipe for becoming President of the United States, although it so happens that the incumbent also fits the description.

Mr. Truman has made history in a big way. The decision to use the atom bomb, the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, point 4, NATO, and the Korean war were all of transcendent importance. Harry Truman has had good reason to observe that "the President of the United States is the world's most influential leader."

As an ex-President he is obviously enjoying life and adding to the enjoyment of others. We hope he is with us for a long time to come, and so, together with most other Americans, we wish Harry Truman many happy returns of the day.

Chief Justice Cites Need for Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Earl Warren delivered the address at the assembly for the dedication of the Gloria in Excelsis Tower of Washington's National Cathedral in Washington on May 7, 1964.